

REMARKS

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 4-8, 10-14, 16, 17, 19-25. are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 17, 21, and 23. No claims are added, withdrawn, or cancelled herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0005] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on March 18, 2009. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner’s willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0006] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0007] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0008] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Claim Amendments

[0009] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 17, 21, and 23 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

Formal Matters

Claim Objections

[0010] The Examiner objects to claims 2, 17 for informalities. Applicant believes that the Examiner meant to object to claim 1 rather than claim 2, as claim 2 was previously cancelled, and the language quoted by the Examiner is similar to that recited in claim 1. Herein, Applicant amends these claims, as shown above, to address the objection made by the Examiner, and to expedite prosecution.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0011] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-14, 16-17, 19-25 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0012] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0013] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone or in combination:

- **Smith:** *Smith, et al.*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028685 (Published February 6, 2003);
- **Stoakley:** *Stoakley, et al.*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0045961 (Published November 29, 2001);
- **Lakshminarayanan:** *Lakshminarayanan, The .NET Schema Object Model*, at <<http://www.xml.com/1pt/a/1074> (1 to 17) 10/21/2007 7:11:45 AM>>, O'Reilly Media, Inc., 1998-2006, pp 17
- **Powers:** *Powers, et al.*, *Visual Basic Programmer's Guide to the .NET Framework Class Library*, January 2, 2002, Sams, pp 1-9

Obviousness Rejections

[0014] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-14, 16-17, 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined cited references. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0015] Applicant submits that the combined references do not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

"generating graphical objects using a first group of services, **wherein the first group of services includes a service that determines a behavior of the graphical objects**"

[0016] In contrast, the primary reference, Smith, describes a programming interface which enables a programmer to specify applications such as web services. The programming interface of Smith also includes a plurality of groups of services. Services cited in the Office Action include those *apparently* enabling drawing of objects and security. Applicant notes that these services only apparently enable such things because only their names, such as "System.Drawing", are provided. Also, Smith mentions that the use of XML and HTML.

[0017] In rejecting claim 9 – the features of which are now incorporated in claim 1 – the Examiner cites paragraph 30, lines 4-8 of Smith, which simply

mentions the well known XML language. Applicant submits, though, that the mere mention of the well-known XML language does not teach or suggest ***a service that determines a behavior of the graphical objects.*** XML is not a service. Further, the portions of Smith cited by the Examiner as disclosing the first group of services – System.Drawing and System.Web.UI – are not described in any greater detail than their mere names. And nothing about those names is sufficient in detail to suggest that the named services include “a service that determines *a behavior of the graphical objects*”, as recited in proposed claim 1.

[0018] As shown above, the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 17 and 23

[0019] These claims include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 17 and 23 are patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 4-14, 16, 19-22, 24, and 25

[0020] Claim 9 is canceled, obviating its rejection.

[0021] Claims 4-8, 10-14, 16, 19-22, 24, and 25 ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 17, and 23. As discussed above, claims 1, 17, and 23 are

allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Conclusion

[0022] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/

Dated: April 14, 2009

Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; x5005)

Registration No. 53725

Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)

Registration No. 56826

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (206) 876-6019

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com